

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/004,399	10/30/2001	Thomas G. Cooper	017516-000130US	5886	
20350	7590 09/09/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	O AND TOWNSEND	LEUBECKER, JOHN P			
TWO EMBAI	RCADERO CENTER OOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN FRANC	ISCO, CA 94111-3834		3739		

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	(
Advisory Action	10/004,399	COOPER, THOMAS	S G.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
The MAN INO DATE of this communication are	John P. Leubecker	3739	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		•	
THE REPLY FILED 19 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper repict places the application.	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The displayed been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: _		sidered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims v			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square ap	proved or b)□ disapproved by	the Examiner.	•
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

10. Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>

John P Leubecker Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3739 Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's statement thanking the Examiner for "pointing out that the Madhani et al. reference (USPN 5,807,377) discusses methods of performing surgical procedures similar to those claimed in the instant application" is confusing since it has no basis. It is noted that no such position was taken in any Office Action. Perhaps Applicant is confusing this application with a different one.